DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 229 283 SO 014 299

AUTHOR McRoy, James J.
TITLE Content Analysis of Essays from a Cross-National Survey: Implications for Teaching Strategies in Holocaust Studies.
PUB DATE 11 Nov 82
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the New Jersey Education Association (Atlantic City, NJ, November 11, 1982).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Comparative Education; Comprehension; Content Analysis; Cross Cultural Studies; *Curriculum Development; *Educational Needs; Educational Research; *History Instruction; Instructional Program Divisions; *Knowledge Level; *Nazism; Secondary Education; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS Great Britain; *Holocaust; United States

ABSTRACT

The content of essays written by randomly selected samples of 1500 U.S. and 500 British secondary students on the topic "What have I learned about Adolf Hitler?" were partitioned into theme-related assertions and analyzed. An experimental group of 150 9th- and 11th-grade male students who had studied the Holocaust also contributed papers that were compared with those in a control sample of U.S. males. General awareness of the meaning of the Holocaust was relatively high for both British and American students, although the former possessed a broader range of knowledge of historical phenomena associated with the event. Students who had studied the Holocaust had a more sophisticated understanding of the topic. Questionnaires soliciting views on curricular issues pertinent to the Holocaust were also completed by 84 voluntarily participating U.S. teachers. Findings suggest that Holocaust curricula should be introduced at the ninth grade and should stress the interplay of psychological and historical factors in genocide within a value-oriented framework. (RM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED229283

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

CONTENT ANALYSIS OF ESSAYS FROM A CROSS-NATIONAL SURVEY: IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING STRATEGIES IN HOLOCAUST STUDIES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
James J. McRoy
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

James J. McRoy
Upsala College

Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the New Jersey Education Association, Atlantic City, N.J., November 11, 1982

SO 014 299

ABSTRACT

Essays were written by two large, fairly representative samples of English-speaking (US/UK) secondary school students on a topic ("What I Have Heard About Adolf Hitler") used in a recent survey of German youth (Bossmann, 1977). Content analysis was used to code meaning units by 50 variables organized within four thematic categories: Psychological Antecedents, Historical Antecedents, Consequences, and Biographical Themes. Documents were scaled for level of sophistication. An "experimental" group of 9th and 11th grade male students who had completed the Holocaust curriculum unit in the Philadelphia public schools also contributed papers that were compared with those in a control sample of U.S. males. General awareness of the meaning of the Holocaust was relatively high for both British and American students, although the former possessed a broader range of knowledge of historical phenomena associated with the event. The results of the pilot study with the Philadelphia group supported the expectation that a more sophisticated understanding of the topic would be evident in the essays of students who had undertaken systematic study of the Holocaust. Results are interpreted from the perspective of attribution theory. 84 participating U.S. teachers responded to a brief questionnaire soliciting their views on curricular issues pertinent to the study of the Holocaust. Implications of the findings suggest that material on the Holocaust might be introduced most effectively as a 9th grade social studies unit and should stress the interplay of psychological and historical factors in genocide within a value-oriented framework.

Following the end of World War II, scholarly work on the Nazi Period has steadily escalated, although media attention has been especially conspicuous in the last five years. Sterlin's (1975) estimate of 50,000 serious works dealing with Hitler and the Nazi Regime suggests the scope of the literature. Since the mid-1970's, college-level courses on the Holocaust have proliferated in the United States (Solkoff & Allen, 1978) whereas secondary schools have been slow to incorporate this material into their curriculum and textbooks (Freedman, 1978; Pate, 1979). While there are notable exceptions at the secondary level such as the pioneer program in the Philadelphia public schools begun in 1978, most curriculum innovation in Holocaust Studies, at least in the public sector, has been found in the Middle Atlantic states.

Young (1981) has recently reviewed the status of research and teaching about the Third Reich in the Federal Republic of Germany. An unsuccessful effort to reduce the amount of time spent in the study of history as a separate discipline and replace it with an "integrated, problem-oriented" social studies course resulted in the retention of history as a separate subject so that National Socialism is now taught as a part of the required history course in the upper grades of all West German secondary schools. Nevertheless, German teachers still complain about the limited amount of time available for the modern history sequence with estimates of ten to twelve hours being modal in the lower tiers of the school system, according to Young's report.

Conditions in Britain and the United States are somewhat different. In Britain, fewer than half of the eligible students

in the upper grades elect history according to reports from numerous teachers interviewed by the author in 1978. In the United States, most secondary school students are required to study American history although formal study of modern World History is not mandated. Pate's (1979) recent analytical examination of 47 U.S. history textbooks in use at the time in the public schools revealed an average of 12 lines or about five sentences relevant to the Holocaust! For World History, Gross (1977) in a recent survey, noted a marked decline in the rate of growth in enrollment in this course over an eleven year period with only 51% of U.S. public secondary schools offering the subject. Moreover, in those schools where it is available, World History gains only 17% of the enrollments in social studies courses. Clearly, few students in the public schools receive either formal or adequate instruction in this significant episode in their recent past through conventional curricular channels.

It was Bossmann's (1977) study that provided the impetus for the present investigation. Impressive in terms of size and representativeness of the sample, over 3000 students in the Federal Republic of Germany wrote impromptu essays in class on the topic: "What I Have Heard About Adolf Hitler". The results of the survey were interpreted as "catastrophic", "frightening", and as reflecting "total confusion". Spear (1977) reached a similar conclusion based on essays in a much smaller sample of American high school students living in Germany: "...more than half of the 150 compositions show a general sort of piecemeal

knowledge...and only a very small percentage...showed any solid knowledge". The contents of Bossmann's book consist primarily of selected excerpts from the German students' essays. Young's (1981) careful review of the entire corpus of this qualitative study "...reveals a considerable amount of fairly sophisticated knowledge among young people, especially those from the Gymnasien, or college preparatory schools".

One of the objectives of the present study is to anchor judgments about the level of students' knowledge of this history in coherent definition and quantitative evaluation. British students were chosen for cross-national comparison as much for practical (e.g., language) as for rational considerations. In addition, a unique opportunity was available to assess the impact on U.S. high school students of the first Holocaust curriculum unit introduced in the public schools of Philadelphia in 1978. The purpose of this article is to present the results of a content analysis of these essays, examine the pattern of information contained in them, and interpret these findings in terms of attribution processes and the degree of sophistication reflected in students' understanding of the watershed event of the twentieth century.

Attribution and Sophistication

The choice of categories and the framework within which they are arranged are a product of Bossmann's (1977) selections and the format of the Philadelphia Holocaust curriculum unit. Two of

the thematic categories are distinguished in terms of the historical and psychological antecedents supporting Hitler's rise to power. Modern attribution theory (Heider, 1958) suggests that situational or historical causes of behavior are given insufficient weight when people are asked to interpret the behavior of other persons. The resulting bias toward psychological or dispositional attributions has been called the fundamental attribution error by Ross (1977). This tendency to 'personalize' history, to account for its phenomena primarily by appealing to psychological traits of its central figures, will be investigated.

The study also examines the extent to which an essay as a whole reflects some degree of sophistication. Applied to a wholistic reading of an essay, the concept implies, at least, that the writer attempts to evaluate any information presented. The most sophisticated documents combine this value judgment with an interpretation of Hitler's role in world events that includes both an appreciation of the historical context in which he lived as well as the personal traits that helped him achieve popular support among his followers. Used in this way, the concept relies, in part, on operations used by Glock, et. al. (1975). In that study of prejudice in adolescents, the concept was defined by three measures: intellectual interests, flexible thinking, and a complex view of human nature. Clearly, any student who dismisses recent historical figures like Hitler or Stalin as demented racists or madmen, who omits reference to significant contextual forces operative in their time, falls short of what is essential in a sophisticated assessment of the roles played by great world leaders.

Method

Content Analysis

Content analysis, the research method used in this study, is a technique that permits the objective, systematic and quantitative analysis of the content of communication messages (Berelson, 1971). Contents of the essays were partitioned as meaning units or theme-related assertions. Four theme categories and 50 content variables or sub-categories* were the organizing elements of the study. The framework of theme categories consisted of: (1) Psychological Antecedents; (2) Historical Antecedents; (3) Biographical Themes; and (4) Consequences. The sub-category units were chosen with the aid of subject matter experts in history and political science. A team of trained judges performed blind codings of the relevance and accuracy of each of the meaning units in each essay. Meaning units judged irrelevant to categories of the coding frame were assigned to a "left-over list". Relevant but inaccurate assertions were assigned separately to the appropriate sub-category of the frame. Global ratings of the level of sophistication of each essay were made on a four-point scale. Level I contained essays in which no evidence could be found for any evaluation or value judgment. Level II represented documents in which the overall assessment of Hitler's role was a positive or appreciative one. Level III included essays for which a negative evaluation was the pervasive sentiment. These scripts reflect an unqualified view that Hitler was essentially a destructive force in world events. Level IV was reserved

* Coding frame and annotated scoring criteria are available from the author.

for papers conveying clear evidence that a student's value judgment is rationalized correctly in an understanding of some aspects of the historical context surrounding Hitler. Such essays would, therefore, contain an evaluation coupled with knowledge and appreciation of some of the relevant environmental forces; in short, a complex view of human nature consistent with the definition of Glock, et. al. (1975).

Reliability and Validity

Five college students who had completed a semester course on the Holocaust served as judges for the project. Together, they participated in a 'norming session' conducted by the author at which the contents of a small practice set of essays were separated into meaning units and scored according to definitional criteria in the coding frame. Each essay in the set was read and scored by each judge, and the results publicly displayed. Coding discrepancies between judges were discussed and attempts made to resolve disagreements. This training was followed by a check on the reliability of the coding procedure by having four of the trained judges code a randomly selected sub-set of 100 essays. Average inter-coder agreement among four pairs of judges for the three phases of the procedure (identification of meaning units, content analysis, and overall ratings of sophistication) was 75%, 78%, and 74%, respectively, with index values ranging between 70% and 82%. Comparatively low reliability indices are not uncommon for thematic analyses (Berelson, 1971).

Validity is typically not a problem in content analysis but is assumed on the basis of careful definition of categories (Budd, 1967). Perfect agreement was reached among the consulting subject-

matter experts on the final placement of the 50 content variables within the four theme categories.

Samples

Subjects were obtained through direct appeals to teachers via trade journals and with the cooperation of supervisors affiliated with the National Council for the Social Studies in the U.S. Initial contacts with teachers did not reveal the specific subject of the research, and its subsequent disclosure resulted in a refusal rate of only 7%. Cooperating teachers were assured of confidentiality for themselves and their students and were given a set of instructions that followed closely those of Bossmann (1977). For example, teachers were advised to announce without advance notice that the essays students were asked to write within the limits of a single class period were to be used in a research project and that they would not be graded. 84 U.S. teachers from 33 states and 29 British teachers from 10 education authorities (including Scotland and Wales) collected over 5000 essays from students between the ages of 10 and 20 years. From this pool, samples of 1500 U.S. and 500 British documents were randomly selected with the restrictions that there be an equal number of boys and girls and approximately equal representation among older and younger students. A stratefied U.S. sample was assembled based on the U.S. Census Bureau's 1976 population statistics for the nine geographical regions. This procedure was not practicable for the British sample because of inaccessibility to the student populations in some regions of that country. For this reason, compared with the U.S., the British sample may be somewhat less

representative of the population of secondary school students.

Five members of the Holocaust Development Staff of the Philadelphia Public School System obtained essays written at the conclusion of the experimental Holocaust Curriculum Unit in the Spring of 1978 by 150 9th and 11th grade male students comprising a pilot group of five classes. Lacking an opportunity to assemble appropriate control groups for an unbiased assessment of this special program, this pilot evaluation is included as merely suggestive of the yield from a properly designed experimental test of the educational impact of such a curriculum innovation. Students in this sub-group produced their essays in class under essentially the same conditions as described earlier in this paper.

Teacher Questionnaire

A short questionnaire was sent to all 96 U.S. teachers who agreed to assist in the collection of essays from their students, following disclosure of the purpose of the study. 84 of these forms were returned, a compliance rate of 88%. Among other items, the questionnaire sought teachers' views on the appropriate grade level and curriculum mode for Holocaust Studies and on the present competence of faculty who would be expected to provide such instruction.

Results

Information Profiles

The results of the content analysis disclosed a general aware-

ness by a majority in both national samples of the connection between Hitler and the Holocaust. Both groups were significantly less well informed about the historical antecedents and consequences of the Nazi regime. Table 1 contains the proportion of subjects,

Insert Table 1 about here

the X^2 values, and the corresponding significance levels for each of two sets of target groups. Of the 50 content variables, 33 differed significantly in the proportion of subjects from the two national groups whose essays contained accurate and relevant content. All but six of these differences favored the British sample. Although over half of the students in each national group linked Hitler to the destruction of European Jewry, only half as many made reference to the larger pattern of genocide that also characterized Germany's objectives in World War II. As shown in Table 1, there are relatively few (12/50) content variables whose average index value exceeds 20%, and only two of these (both psychological) are in the Antecedent Theme Category. Of the 19 variables included as Consequences Themes, 5% or fewer of the students in the two national samples made reference to more than six of them. No significant difference in factual errors was obtained in the cross-national comparison, although American students made significantly more assertions that could not be coded within the analytical frame and British students' essays were longer, totaling more meaning units.

The content analysis for the other set of target groups is also shown in Table 1. Here the Philadelphia pilot group is

compared with its age and sex cohort in the larger U.S. sample. Inferences based on this comparison are tentative because of the inability to match groups on cognitive variables. Like the British students, this 'experimental' group was demonstrably better informed in the categories of Historical Antecedents and Consequences, exceeding the controls on about half of these content variables. The pattern was reversed for the Biographical Themes with reliable group differences on fewer variables. Psychologically, the instructed group showed less tendency to personalize their accounts, especially to suggest pathology in Hitler as a causal determinant of the Holocaust. Instead, his role was seen by more 'experimentals' as that of ideologue and master of propaganda. Longer essays with more meaning units as well as more irrelevant assertions were also characteristic of the instructed group in this comparison.

Macroanalysis of Content

A quantitative index of the degree of bias toward dispositional attributions (fundamental attribution error) can be found in the difference between the number of psychological and historical antecedents cited in a document. This measure permits individual or group comparisons of the extent to which emphasis is given to psychological or dispositional traits as opposed to environmental or historical forces in explanations of a person's acts. Table 2

Insert Table 2 about here

presents the mean thematic category scores and the FAE scores for

each of the four target groups. It is clear from this data that American students make significantly more dispositional attributions in reflecting on Hitler than do their British counterparts, a pattern that is reversed in the other set of U.S. target groups.

Relative proportions of subjects at the four levels of sophistication are shown in Table 3. No reliable differences were found

Insert Table 3 about here

in cross national comparisons at any level. An average of only 14% of the essays met the criteria for the highest level (IV) with most of the remainder about equally divided between Level I (No Value Judgment) and Level III (Negative Evaluation). In the Holocaust curriculum assessment, the pattern was somewhat different. Here, a significant shift occured between Levels III and IV for the instructed group, with 25% writing at the most sophisticated level. Most of this advantage was associated with higher grade placement, whereas age differences on other variables within this pilot group were few and inconsistent.

Age and sex variables were controlled in the present study although predictions about differences in essay content associated with them were not made. Because of the restricted age range and the homogeneity of the samples, it was considered unlikely that age-related differences in the contents of impromptu papers by secondary school students would be found. On the other hand, Aronson has noted that there are certain topics such as "...civil defense, cancer research, von Hindenberg and so on...topics that

the culture trains men and boys to take a greater interest in than women and girls" (1976, p. 181-182). In fact, a recent national poll of 19,000 U.S. high school students found boys more knowledgeable about Nazism than girls (Scholastic Poll, September 17, 1978).

Interestingly, age and sex differences were significant for 13 of the 16 variables tested in the macroanalysis. Longer essays containing more meaning units were written by females and older students, although this finding does not necessarily imply that these two groups were more knowledgeable and sophisticated about their subject. In fact, it was the males whose mean scores were higher in all thematic categories (except the FAE variable) listed in Table 2 and whose essays were more likely to be represented at Level IV of the sophistication ratings. Indeed, the longer essays of the girls contained significantly more unclassifiable theme units and factual errors. This complexity did not extend to age differences, however. Here, older students maintained a consistent superiority over their younger counterparts in virtually every category of the analysis, including proneness to make errors and irrelevant assertions. To measure the extent to which an essay's length contributes to age and sex differences like those cited above, an analysis of covariance was performed on the main content variables with the length of the document controlled as a covariate. The results of this analysis confirmed the expectancy that the higher scores on the 13 variables in the macroanalysis is a simple function of a greater amount of information (relevant, irrelevant and inaccurate) contained in the documents

of students in the upper grades. However, the reexamination of sex differences also made it clear that a longer essay is no guarantee of advantage in a student's information profile, a fact well known to teachers. With document length controlled, boys' scores in most content-related categories remained significantly higher than girls.

Questionnaire Inquiry

Although the small sample (N=84) of teachers participating in the present study is clearly a select group in terms of its initial willingness to assist with research, the low refusal rate following disclosure of the subject of investigation is encouraging. The following is a summary of some of the views of these teachers based on the tabulation of their responses to questionnaire items: (1) Overwhelming endorsement was obtained (94%) for the suggestion that Hitler should be accorded major status as an historical figure in world history. (2) Opinion was about evenly divided over where students obtain their information about Hitler's role in recent European history, half suggesting school as the principal source with the rest favoring the media. Sources other than these accounted for less than 12% of the replies. (3) One third of the respondents considered material related to the Holocaust most appropriate for 9th grade World History or government courses. About 40% preferred the medium of a social studies course and fewer than 15% chose 8th grade American history or some other alternative. (4) Three fourths of the teachers agreed that the present level of interest in Holocaust Studies is not transient;

however, a similar proportion disagreed that today's social studies faculty are adequately equipped to teach this subject based on their present level of training.

Conclusions

The essays examined in this study contain a set of features that may be prototypical of students' understanding of many historical phenomena. First, there is the absence of context. When asked what they had heard about Hitler, students' responses clearly revealed what Bauer (1978) has called the "monster perception" of the Holocaust or what psychologists know as a fundamental attribution error, exacerbated in this instance by a "negativity effect" (cf., Lau, 1979; Freedman, et. al., 1981). The latter concept implies that negative traits affect social impressions more than does information based on positive qualities. The most common antecedent content in the papers of U.S. students was reference to an alleged pathological state depicted in a remark such as: "Hitler was a madman". This tendency to 'personalize' history or to locate the causes of events (e.g., Holocaust) primarily in the characteristics of people associated with them (e.g., Hitler) was much less evident in the writings of British subjects and the Philadelphia students who had studied the special curriculum unit on the Holocaust. Absence of context can also be found in the apparent ignorance of many of the other important consequences associated with Nazism. For example, the important distinction between the Holocaust and the more general

Axis policy of Genocide was made by fewer than 25% of the U.S. students, and references to Nazi medical experiments, resistance and collaboration movements, post-war division of Germany and the creation of the State of Israel were essentially nonexistent. An implication of this for more effective instruction has recently been suggested by Princeton historian, Robert Tucker, one that takes the form of both admonition and challenge to teachers. At a recent conference dealing with the relationship between psychology and history, he offered the following observations: "There is a great danger in focusing on personal psychology. The real challenge is to deal with the interplay between the ruler's psychology and the setting" (APA Monitor, August, 1982, p. 43).

A second implication of the findings concerns the need to raise the current level of sophistication of students' understanding of historical phenomena. The level represented in the essays of this study was unimpressive by most standards. One reason for retaining Bossmann's choice of the essay in lieu of the more sensitive questionnaire methodology was a desire to examine any evidence of spontaneous political-moral judgment. While over half the students made some attempt to evaluate their subject, for most that judgment was a simple, relatively uninformed indictment of Hitler. Littell predicted in 1978 that in eight or ten years, less time will be spent on the "pathological side" of Holocaust studies and that, instead, educators will find in those lessons a vehicle for the consideration of moral issues (Chronicle of Higher Education, May 1, 1978). Again, the evidence reported

here suggests that a values-oriented approach such as that adolpted by current Holocaust curriculum guides can make a significant contribution toward enhancing the sophistication students bring to a task of communicating what they know about a complex topic.

Finally, several considerations make it clear that an effective pedagogical paradigm for teaching complex historical events such as the Holocaust is one that is based on a meaningful interface between the contributions of the disciplines of the behavioral sciences (e.g., obedience to authority, violence, "survivor syndrome", authoritarianism, psychological factors in anti-semitism) and history (e.g., European collaboration and resistance, cues for future genocides, antecedents of Nazism, historical roots of anti-semitism) and which incorporates value-oriented instruction (Solkoff & Allen, 1978). (1) Traditional patterns of social studies offerings have changed dramatically since 1961 and with those changes has come an overall decline in the number of secondary school students who study history (Gross, 1977). Concurrent with this decline, the "Gross Report" documents significant growth in the popularity of courses in the behavioral sciences, especially psychology. The interdisciplinary nature of Holocaust Studies could have the salutary effects of revitalizing student interest in history as well as meeting some of their present needs in behavioral science. (2) Inadequate history textbooks and teachers with insufficient preparation in this country (Pate, 1979; Davidowitz, 1981) and in Europe (Dornberg, 1975; Huchet-Bishop, 1978) represent the most serious and immediate obstacle in the path of Holocaust Studies at the

secondary level. Whether the short shrift given the Holocaust in history courses results from "hostility on the part of established academic disciplines" as Friedlander suggests (Chronicle of Higher Education, May 1, 1978) or from a more benign conservatism that requires even more temporal distance between the record of the event and its interpretation is an issue historians must resolve. What seems essential now in the face of persistent genocide, prejudice, and persecution of minorities in many parts of the world, is that students learn of the connections between authoritarian forms of government and the likely consequences of these regimes for human rights and personal freedom. The California studies have clearly documented not only a lack of knowledge on the part of adults of the legacy of Nazism but an even greater willingness by teenagers to accept negative stereotypes of the kind that were so attractive to members of the Hitler Youth (Glock, et. al., 1975). Small wonder that so many of today's youth show a superficiality of knowledge about the events surrounding a figure who, only two generations ago, helped bring about fundamental changes in the world in which they live. The evidence presented here and the results of a cross-national curriculum project (U.S., Israel, and the Federal Republic of Germany) suggest that teaching the Holocaust as "education toward values" is one strategy that can replace preconceived judgments and stereotypes with efforts toward critical thinking (Carmon, 1980).

References

Aronson, E. The social animal. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman & Co., 1976.

Berelson, B. Content analysis in communication research. New York: Hafner Publishing Co., 1971.

Bauer, Y. The holocaust in historical perspective. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1978.

Bossmann, D. Was ich über Adolf Hitler gehört habe. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1977.

Budd, R. W., Thorpe, R. K. & Donohew, L. Content analysis of communication. New York: Macmillan Co., 1967.

Carmon, A. Problems in coping with the holocaust: experiences with students in a multi-national program. Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1980, 450, 227-236.

Davidowicz, L. S. The holocaust and the historians. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1981.

Dornberg, J. The new germans: thirty years after. New York: Macmillan, 1975.

Fest, J. C. Hitler. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Jovanovich, Inc., 1974.

Freedman, J. L., Sears, D. O. & Carlsmith, J. M. Social Psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. : Prentice Hall, 1981.

Freedman, T. Introduction: why teach about the holocaust? Social Education, 1978, 42, 262.

Glock, C. Y., Wuthnow, R., Piliavin, J. A. & Spencer, M. Adolescent prejudice. New York: Harper & Row, Inc., 1975.

Gross, R. E. The status of social studies in the public schools of the United States: facts and impressions of a national survey. Social Education, 1977, 41, 194-205.

Heider, F. Social perception and phenomenal causality. Psychological Review, 1944, 57, 243-259.

Huchet-Bishop, C. French history textbooks and the holocaust. Paper presented at the Fourth Annual Conference on the Holocaust, Philadelphia, Pa., 1978.

Lau, R. R. Negativity in perception with application to political behavior. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of California, Los Angeles, 1979.

Pate, G. S. Textbook treatment of the holocaust. Paper presented at the Second National Invitational Conference on Teaching about the Nazi Holocaust and Genocide, Arlington, Virginia, October 8, 1979.

Ross, L. The intuitive psychologist and his short-comings: distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, Vol. 10. New York: Academic Press, 1977.

Spear, M. Adolf who? The Stars and Stripes, 1977, 31, 14-15.

Solkoff, N. & Allen, W. S. Teaching the holocaust at the university level. Teaching of Psychology, 1978, 5, 189-191.

Stierlin, H. Adolf Hitler: Familienperspektiyven. Frankfurt am Main, 1975.

Young, A. P. Germans, history and the nazi past. Social Education, 1981, 45, 85-98.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 1

Proportion of Subjects by Content Variable

Content Variable	U.S.[a]	U.K.[b]	Chi Square	'Exp.' Males	Control[c] Males	Chi Square[d]
I. Psychological Antecedents						
1. Psychopathological Refs.	29	20	15.1*****	18	27	4.9*
2. Ideologue & Author	22	26	2.5	47	28	20.2*****
3. Charismatic Leadership	12	5	19.2*****	7	8	0.2
4. Intellectual Ability	12	9	2.0	18	12	2.8
5. Oratorical Skill	9	7	3.1	7	9	0.7
II. Historical Antecedents						
6. Economic Conditions	8	13	9.1***	22	10	14.6*****
7. Nationalism, Militarianism & Authoritarianism	2	9	46.4*****	1	1	0.0
8. Versailles Treaty	2	9	46.9*****	7	3	4.2*
9. Institl'. & Mass Complicity	5	1	46.4*****	1	2	0.0
10. Blood Purge of SA	0	3	23.3*****	2	0	4.4*
11. German Anti-Semitism	2	3	2.5	14	2	50.0*****
12. Weimar Republic	1	2	1.4	1	1	0.1
III. Biographical Themes						
13. Personal Qualities	47	54	5.4*	56	45	6.5*
14. Reich Chancellor: 1933-45	38	56	48.3*****	65	44	23.5*****
15. Death by Suicide	37	48	17.8*****	35	38	0.9
16. National Origin	20	42	94.0*****	18	22	1.0
17. Pol. Ambition: World Dom.	31	27	2.0	33	36	0.5
18. Pol. Development: NSDAP	19	30	25.5*****	29	20	5.4*
19. Ideology: Anti-Democratic	25	21	5.0	35	23	9.0**
20. Imprisonment at Landsberg	12	18	7.6***	10	16	3.8*
21. Command of Armed Forces	10	18	22.4*****	10	11	0.0
22. Physical Characteristics	10	18	24.8*****	5	9	2.8
23. Military Service: WW I	5	18	67.2*****	5	7	0.8
24. Women	12	11	1.0	10	13	1.5
25. Nazi Leaders & Axis Allies	7	15	27.9*****	14	9	3.2
26. Artist's Life in Vienna	8	12	5.9**	5	10	4.0*
27. Propaganda & Media Control	7	9	2.3	18	6	19.2*****
28. Munich "Beer Hall" Putsch	4	7	5.1*	4	6	0.6
29. Family & Childhood	4	4	0.4	3	5	0.7
30. Educational Background	2	5	8.2***	4	2	0.7
31. Physical Illnesses	3	0	10.9*****	1	3	1.6
IV. Consequences						
32. Holocaust	63	58	3.8*	86	59	37.8*****
33. Tyranny (SS, Gestapo, etc.)	21	32	22.6*****	56	15	116.1*****
34. Genocide	23	27	3.7*	35	23	8.7***
35. Initiator of WW II	13	24	29.5*****	14	16	0.3
36. Specific Military Opns.	7	27	131.4*****	22	11	13.6*****
37. Nuremberg Racial Laws	9	18	30.8*****	11	14	0.9
38. Implementation of Race Pol.	9	5	7.9***	0	4	4.9*
39. Full Emplmt'. & Public Works	2	7	27.3*****	3	2	0.1
40. Strategic Military Errors	5	5	0.0	6	8	0.4
41. Unconditional Surrender	1	8	64.8*****	1	1	0.2
42. Medical Experiments	3	1	5.5**	7	2	10.0***
43. Resistance Movements	2	2	1.6	1	2	2.8
44. Divided Germany	1	1	0.1	0	1	0.1
45. Creation of State of Israel	1	1	0.1	7	3	4.2*
46. Kristallnacht	0	1	7.8**	4	0	20.6*****
47. Communist Dom. of E. Europe	0	1	8.1**	0	0	0.9
48. Pers. Loyalty Oath: Military	1	0	3.4	1	0	2.6
49. Nuremberg War Crimes Trials	0	0	0.4	2	0	4.4*
50. Collaboration	0	0	2.4	0	0	0.9

*p < .05
**p < .01
***p < .005
****p < .001
*****p < .0001

a N = 1500
b N = 500
c N = 150
d N = 750

Table 2

Mean Thematic Category Scores

	Thematic Category	U.S.[a]	U.K.[b]	Chi Square	'Exp.'[c] Males	Control[d] Males	Chi Square
I.	Antecedents	1.04	1.06	4.7	1.44	1.04	18.9*
	1. Psychological[e]	.84	.66	14.6*	.97	.85	4.7
	2. Historical[e]	.14	.29	37.4***	.34	.14	31.7***
	3. FAE Scores[f]	.65	.33	91.1***	.49	.66	28.7**
II.	Biographical Themes	2.83	4.06	134.9***	3.57	3.26	19.2
III.	Consequences	1.61	2.17	75.6***	2.50	1.58	64.9***

*P < .005
**P < .0005
***P < .0001

a N=1500
b N= 500
c N= 150
d N= 750
e Adjusted for differences in number of content variables
f Fundamental Attribution Error (FAE=# PSY - # HIS Variables)

Table 3

Proportion of Subjects by Level of Sophistication

Level of Sophistication	U.S.[a]	U.K.[b]	Chi Square	'Exp.'[c] Males	Control[d] Males	Chi Square
I.	43.4	46.2	1.2	41.5	42.3	0.0
II.	3.3	2.9	0.3	6.8	4.6	0.8
III.	37.7	37.6	0.0	26.5	35.5	4.0*
IV.	15.7	13.3	1.6	25.2	17.4	4.4*

*P < .05

a N=1500
b N= 500
c N= 150
d N= 750